



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

economic side was slighted, and it was enough to give the texts of his state papers. Dr. Culbertson compares the various forms of the well-known report on manufactures, and measures the influence of Adam Smith. He makes use of the material gathered by Hamilton when preparing his report, material giving interesting information on the condition and prospects of various industries in the different states. More could have been made of Hamilton's own venture into a manufacturing concern, unsuccessful as it proved in the issue. The limits of Hamilton's protective policy are defined, and they rest upon his nationalism. The "harmony of interests," so much pleaded by Carey and his followers, owed much to Hamilton, for he regarded antagonisms of interest within the nation as superficial and due to the inability of people to comprehend their welfare as a whole (p. 135). His home-market argument rested upon his plan of national independence, and politically it is above criticism. The financial measures and foreign policy of Hamilton do not offer the same opportunity for original research, but throughout the volume the author shows a breadth and candor that is refreshing; Loria, Rabbeno, List, and Sumner are quoted, and without bias. The essay is an attempt to apply Hamilton's policies to current social questions, and dogmatic assertions are not infrequent, such as: "Hamilton was in no way the prophet and champion of the capitalistic class; he was the prophet and champion of American Union." The study requires correction from the writings of such critics as Adams and Jefferson.

WORTHINGTON C. FORD.

*American Colonial Government, 1696-1765. A Study of the British Board of Trade in its Relation to the American Colonies, Political, Industrial, Administrative.* By OLIVER MERTON DICKERSON. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1912. Pp. 390. \$4.00.)

Dr. Dickerson has written a book of first importance for the study of American colonial history. It concerns an organ of the British system of colonial control that was fundamentally concerned with the welfare and development of the colonies, and was in its widest aspect in immediate charge of all matters of trade and commerce with which the British empire had to deal. Yet, despite its importance, no writer has hitherto attempted to investigate its work or to determine the measure of its influence. As far as any

accurate understanding of its place in colonial history is concerned, the Board of Trade has been persistently ignored by English and American historians, yet to understand American colonial history without it is equivalent to a certain proverbial attitude toward the play of Hamlet.

Dr. Dickerson has divided his work into six sections. The first treats of the organization and personnel of the board, dealing with the establishment of the plantation office, the members of the board, their political position and terms of service, and the periods of varying activity. The second discusses the relation of the board to other departments, the Privy Council and its committee, the Secretary of State, the Admiralty, and the Treasury, the Bishop of London, and Parliament. The third takes up the difficulties of colonial administration, considering first the postal service, and second the opposition in the colonies, due to the aggressive policy of the colonial assemblies and the weakness of the governor's position. The fourth outlines the imperialistic policy of the board, as seen in the plans for a colonial civil list, the control of the judiciary, the reduction of all the colonies to the royal type, and their union for military purposes. The fifth treats of colonial legislation, the royal power of disallowance, and the right of complaint and of appeal from the colonial courts. The sixth, and last, covers a group of subjects falling outside the other sections, such as boundaries, trade, defense, and Indian affairs.

All these aspects of the Board of Trade's activity the author handles with skill and scholarly acumen. His search among the British records has been extensive, though not complete, and the information that he has acquired is sufficient for a treatment that may be considered in a sense preliminary and not final. There is still much to be done upon every question that Dr. Dickerson raises, but for a first work upon the general subject he has produced a book that is remarkably well done. No student can ignore it, and we can but hope that it will stimulate others to enter the same field. During the next few years we are likely to see many works, like this and the recently published volume by Dr. Root on the relations of Pennsylvania with the British government, treating of British control and administration, if for no other reason than that historical science, like nature, abhors a vacuum. Probably many of these works will overstress the importance of the British side and neglect the colonial, which is also inevitable, for the

new view is suggestive and alluring. Probably, also, the results will be embodied in papers and monographs, of the variety disliked by the reading public, because hard to read and harder still to understand. But in time the balance will be restored, the relation of things British and things American will be adjusted, and out of the coördinating process a truer colonial history will be born.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*Yale University.*

*New Zealand.* By ROBERT STOUT and J. LOGAN STOUT. (Cambridge: The University Press. 1911. Pp. 185.)

Students of political and economic conditions in New Zealand should welcome this little book, for it gives an excellent summary of the history of the country and an immense amount of information about its physical features, the people, the chief products, the government and laws, the education system, and the experiments in social legislation that have made the Dominion famous. No man is better fitted to write such a book than Sir Robert Stout, the "Grand Old Man" of New Zealand, who has been intimately connected with public affairs for many years, was twice Prime Minister, has been Chief Justice since the year 1899, and has held many other important offices. In this work he has been ably assisted by his son, J. Logan Stout.

From the point of view of an outsider it seems a pity that the authors have confined themselves almost wholly to description, and have not ventured to give an estimate of the results of New Zealand legislation. It is evident, however, that the hopes of Mr. Reeves, Mr. Tregear, and other ardent reformers have not been fully realized, and that the working people of New Zealand are little, if any, better off than one would expect them to be in a country of such great resources with a population relatively so small. This is the general impression that one receives in reading the book, and it is confirmed by the following passage:—

"The great organization of the State is being used to give an equal chance to all. The New Zealanders may fail, and their experiments may show that the ever-present danger of a true democracy lies in the deadening of individual energy and enterprise by the growth of an all-embracing State interference. But if they fail, their strivings will not have been in vain, though humanity be the poorer for their failure. For the present, they feel that State control is better than to be the slaves of monopolizing companies or autocratic millionaires, or to be strangled in the grip of all-powerful trusts."